



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,876	02/27/2004	Scott Musson	ORACL-01378US0	7119
80548	7590	01/25/2010	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 CALIFORNIA STREET 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108			KUMAR, ANIL N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/25/2010	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OFFICEACTIONS@FDML.COM

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/788,876	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MUSSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ANIL N. KUMAR	<b>Art Unit</b> 2174	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/23/09.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-20, 59-74, 76-79 and 81-84 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-20, 59-74, 76-79 and 81-84 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                        |                                                                   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                       | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/23/09</u> .                                                | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to the **RCE filed November 23, 2009** (original application filed February 27, 2004). Applicant has amended claims 1, 13-15, 17, 59, 72-74, 76 and cancelled claims 16, 21-58, 75, 80 and added new claims 81-83. **THIS ACTION IS MADE NON-FINAL.** Claims 1-15, 17-20, 59-74, 76-79 and 81-84 are pending of which claims 1, 21, 40 and 59 are in independent form. Claims 1-15, 17-20, 59-74, 76-79 and 81-84 are presented for examination.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-15, 17-20, 59-74, 76-79 and 81-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff et al. ("Anuff", US 6, 327,628 B1) in view of Abel et al. ("Abel", US 2003/0084401 A1).

Claims 1 and 59: Anuff disclose methods and media for rendering a portal graphical user interface (GUI) (the portal server presents initial view, column 2 lines 1-27 and Fig. 2), comprising:

Art Unit: 2174

- providing as a set of controls (see various controls 22, 24 in Fig. 2), wherein the set of controls can be organized in a logical hierarchy (as well as their order -hierarchy- of appearance... column 4 lines 6-14 and Fig. 2), wherein each said control represents a corresponding graphical element in the portal GUI (Fig. 2), wherein each said control has properties that can be read and set (the personalization buttons enable the user to revise the layout of the portal, change its color scheme, and edit that user's account, e.g. change a password, column 3 lines 40-57), wherein each said control is implemented as one or more classes in an object-oriented programming paradigm (The portal server is an object-oriented system built on such an object model, illustrated in FIGS. 4, 6 and 7, column 4 lines 60-67), wherein each said control has one or more methods which can be overridden to provide specialization of the control (In the case of the news module -control-, these customizations could be default news categories that individual users can override for their own front pages, categories that users are required to include on their own front pages, or a combination of the two, column 14 lines 15-30);
- traversing, using at least one processor (PC/Browser in Fig. 1), the logical hierarchy, wherein the traversing comprises:
  - associating a first theme with a first control in the set of controls (associating a control by changing its color scheme, column 3 lines 54-57 and Fig. 2) ;

Art Unit: 2174

- rendering the first control according to the first theme (4. Assign styles to elements in page , column 8 lines 22-49);
- rendering any descendents of the first control according to the first theme unless the theme is overridden (see hierarchy and ownership under the Legend in Fig. 4);

but does not explicitly disclose,

- overriding a second control, which is a descendent of the first control, with a second theme such that the second control uses the second theme and any descendent of the second control uses the second theme unless the second theme is overridden.;
- rendering the first control according to the first theme in parallel with rendering of the second control according to the second theme.

However, Abel disclose a method for localizing (customization/overriding, paragraph [0002]) a Web page based on a selected characteristic, such as a culture, a skin, a filtered set of functions, or other desired trait (paragraph [0008]), and further disclose, the instance of the LocalizedPage class overrides the standard Render method of the standard ASP.NET Page class (paragraphs [0043-0045] and Fig. 6), and further teach, defining override values for any dependent at any level (the Web designer defines a localization element with a unique element key, paragraph 0040-42] and Fig. 5) and further teach, rendering controls based on their properties (On a Render event, the ASP.NET runtime checks a virtual table to determine that an instance of the LocalizedPage class is

Art Unit: 2174

to be called instead of an instance of the standard Page class, paragraph [0052-53] and Fig. 9). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of this invention to combine the theme localization/overriding and rendering, as taught by Abel, in Anuff's method, in order to provide the user customization options, so that the user will be able to have a custom localized web page that is particularly suited for their needs.

Claims 2 and 61: Anuff disclose:

- representing a desktop in the GUI by a desktop control, wherein the desktop is a view of a portal (i.e. ...views are the front page of a portal ... column 6 lines 48-54 and Fig. 2);
- and wherein the desktop control is hierarchically superior to a shell control in the GUI and to a book control in the GUI (see the Layout->Group->ModuleView hierarchy in Fig. 4).

Claims 3 and 62: Anuff disclose:

- using a look and feel control to determine an appearance of the portal (i.e. ...Site look and feel ... column 14 lines 54-63);

Claims 4 and 63: Anuff disclose: using book to navigate to at least one portal page control in the portal (see >Bookmarks< , >News< portals in Fig. 2), and

wherein the book is represented by a book control (see >XYZ Corp. Home Page< in Fig. 2).

Claims 5 and 64: Anuff disclose wherein: using one control of the set of controls to respond to an event raised by another control of the set of controls (see >Search< in Fig. 2).

Claims 6 and 65: Anuff disclose wherein: associating an interchangeable persistence mechanism with a control of the set of controls (see >manage persistence< in Fig. 4).

Claims 7 and 66: Anuff disclose wherein: associating an interchangeable rendering mechanism with a control of the set of controls (i.e. ... displaying some aspects of module's data ... column 7 lines 5-26).

Claims 8 and 67: Anuff disclose further comprising: accepting a request to access the portal (Fig. 3).

Claims 9 and 68: Anuff disclose wherein: allowing the request to be a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) request (i.e. ...contains a HTTP request ... column 6 lines 59-66 and Fig. 3).

Art Unit: 2174

Claims 10 and 69: Anuff disclose wherein: originating the request from a Web browser (see Figs. 1 and 3).

Claims 11 and 70: Anuff disclose further comprising: generating a response from a portal (i.e. ...contains a HTTP response ... column 6 lines 59-66 and Fig. 3).

Claims 12 and 71: Anuff disclose wherein: using a control of the set of controls to represent one of: button, text field, menu, table, window, window control, title bar, pop-up window, check-box button, radio button, window frame, desktop, shell, head, body, header, footer, book, page, layout, placeholder, portlet and toggle button (Fig. 2).

Claims 13 and 72: Anuff disclose wherein: associating the first theme with the first control can occur when the first control is rendered (i.e. ... Portal Page Info object 48 tells the modules about the display characteristics...column 7 lines 51-53 and Fig. 4).

Claims 14 and 73: Anuff disclose wherein: using the first control to inherit the first theme from a parent control (i.e. ... given the primary group, the portal web site can be written to exploit the style... column 15 lines 59-67).



Art Unit: 2174

Claims 15 and 74: Anuff disclose wherein: using the theme to specify at least one of the appearance and functioning of a control in the GUI (i.e. ...means of associating formatting intelligence with specific portions of a page.... Column 14 lines 66-67).

Claims 17 and 76: Anuff disclose wherein: specifying the first theme in whole or in part by a properties file (i.e. ...upload style files-properties can be in multiple files- to the portal web site... column 15 line 32).

Claims 18 and 77: Anuff disclose wherein: including in the properties file at least one of: 1) cascading style sheet; 2) Java Server Page; 3) Extensible Markup Language; 4) text; 5) Hypertext Markup Language; 6) Extensible Hypertext Markup Language; 7) JavaScript; and 8) Flash MX (i.e. ...create the style's source code in a file... column 15 lines 27-30).

Claims 19 and 78: Anuff disclose wherein: using the properties file to specify at least one image (i.e. ...upload style files-can include a image file- to the portal web site... column 15 line 32).

Claims 20 and 79: Anuff disclose wherein: using the GUI as a part of a portal on the World Wide Web (Figs. 1 and 2).

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 81: Anuff disclose, using a first thread to render the first control, and a different thread to render another control in the set of controls (Tasks -from the controls- can be set up to run as external programs, Java programs in separate JVMs, on separate threads in the current JVM, or on the current thread, column 12 lines 4-14).

Claim 82: Anuff disclose, using a mainline render to obtain a render result for a control in the set of controls, if said control has been previously rendered by a separate render process (Each portal server web page -rendering a page- checks for the User object cached in the session; if none exists, the login page is displayed instead, column 13 lines 45-48).

Claim 83: Anuff disclose, including content from an external site in each threads that is used to render one or more controls of the set of controls (a parsing technology is employed for retrieving data from external web sites and various other sources, column 10 lines 51-67).

3. Claim 84 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff et al. ("Anuff", US 6, 327,628 B1) in view of Abel et al. ("Abel", US 2003/0084401 A1) and further view of Saulpaugh et al. ("Saulpaugh", US 7,548,946 B1).

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 84: Neither Anuff nor Abel, singularly or in combination, do not explicitly teach, and at least one said control can interact with another said control through an event notification mechanism.

However, Saulpaugh disclose a distributed computing environment, where a message gate or a graphical element to communicate (Abstract), and further teach, graphical elements or message gates intercommunicates using event or message notification (Messages may also be described that are to be sent from the service, such as response messages and event notification messages, columns 17-18 and lines 63-23). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of this invention to combine the IPC based on event notification provided in Java technologies, as taught by Saulpaugh, in Anuff's Java-based method, in order to provide the user with control mechanisms based on event notification, which allows for more sophisticated override mechanisms. Motivation to combine Saulpaugh with modified Anuff comes from Anuff (The portal server of the present invention can notify servers -processes- , columns 11/12 lines 64-2),

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed on November 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009 have been considered but were not persuasive.

- A. Applicant argues, "However, Applicant respectfully submits that viewing different types of information is a feature at the user side, while rendering different controls in parallel, as embodied in Claim 1, is a feature at the server side. Hence there is no indication in Anuff that different controls can be rendered in parallel". The Examiner respectfully disagrees and points out, although viewing information is a client side activity, but the generation of information, i.e. controls in the portals, are done on the server side, as Anuff clearly teach the functionality associated with the portal is provided by a portal server, running on one or more of the servers 12a-12n... (column 4 lines 15-32 and Fig. 3).
- B. Applicant argues, "However, there is no indication in Abel that any descendent of the instance of the LocalizedPage class uses the special Render method unless it is overridden, and there is also no indication in Abel that the rendering of the instance of the LocalizedPage class is in parallel with the rendering of the standard ASP.NET page class". The Examiner respectfully disagrees and points out Abel clearly teach, overriding the LocalizedPage class the instance of the LocalizedPage class overrides the standard Render method of the standard ASP.NET Page class, paragraph [0043] and Fig. 6).
- C. Applicant argues, "However, there is no indication in Saulpaugh that the message gate represents a corresponding graphical and functional element in the portal GUI. In addition, there is no indication in Saulpaugh that the event notification message is from another control in the same portal GUI". The

Art Unit: 2174

Examiner respectfully disagrees and points out Saulpaugh clearly teach, the use of a GUI (an advertisement 132 ) as a message gate (The client 110 may use the advertisement 132 to instantiate a gate 130, column 14 lines 51-65 and Fig. 8).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anil N. Kumar whose telephone number is (571) 270-1693 and Fax number is (571) 270-2693. The examiner can normally be reached on Wednesdays and alternate Mon-Tue and Thu-Fri EST (Alternate Mon-Tue and Thu-Fri off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Dennis Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2174

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ANK

1/12/2010

/DENNIS-DOON CHOW/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174